IRAN

Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies

VOLUME XXVIII 1990

CONTENTS

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PERSIAN STUDIES

c/o The British Academy, 20–21 Cornwall Terrace, London NW1 4QP

Price: £20

ISSN 0578-6967

THE SUFI *SHAYKH* AND THE SULTAN: A CONFLICT OF CLAIMS TO AUTHORITY IN MEDIEVAL INDIA

By Simon Digby

Jersey

The claims of Sufi *shaykh*s to be sources of authority in medieval India, and in particular in the greater Delhi sultanate of the thirteenth and fourteenth Christian centuries, have been surveyed elsewhere by the present writer, but space prevented a detailed examination of the relations between Sufi *shaykh*s on whose behalf a claim of territorial *wilāyat* was advanced and the Muslim rulers or *de facto* powerholders of the same regions.[1]

I THE SUFI *SHAYKH'S WILĀYAT* IN CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

The territorial *wilāyat* of the Sufi *shaykh* was considered as having a direct influence on the political events and material destiny of the realm over which it was exercised.[2] Thus the prosperity of the reign of Sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Khaljī (regn. 1296–1316) might be attributed to the influence of the unbounded blessings of "the King of *Shaykhs*" Niẓām al-Dīn "Awliyāʾ".[3] Equally, the decline in the fortunes of the sultanate might be attributed to the removal of such spiritual protection. ʿIṣāmī, writing some twenty-five or thirty years after the event in a new secessionist Muslim state in the Deccan, maintained that the power and prosperity passed away from Delhi with the death of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn:

> He was one of the friends of God
> Through whom the realm of Hindōstān was maintained.
> First that man of wise dominion
> Set out from Dehlī to another kingdom;[4]
> After this that city and country were ruined;
> Discord prevailed in that realm.[5]

This belief in the ability of Sufi *shaykh*s to exercise, through their spiritual strength, a decisive influence on the outcome of material events is well illustrated by a number of references in the conversations of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn himself to the ever-present menace of attacks of the Mongols:

1. When the Mongols besieged Multan, Shaykh Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtyār one night gave an arrow into the hands of the ruler Qubācha, with instructions to loose it in the darkness against the army of the unbelievers. In the morning the besieging host had vanished.[6]

2. In the year when the *wilāyat* of Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn (Niẓām al-Dīn's predecessor) was removed by death, the Mongols came and devastated the Panjab.[7]

3. When in Khwārazm the great Shaykh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā had pronounced that the Khwārazmshāh and his whole kingdom were the blood-price (*diyat*) for the murder of one of his disciples, the *Shaykh* added: "O that I had not spoken this word (*āh nafas-i khwud-rā bērūn na-mēāwurdam!*)"

Such spoken words (*nafas*, "breath") of a *shaykh* had an especial force which the Shaykh himself would be powerless to reverse. In this case, the consequence of Shaykh Najm al-Dīn's words were that Khwārazm was overrun in Chinggiz Khān's first western campaign.[8]

The Sultan could recruit, as objects of his bounty and clients of his patronage, Sufis with lesser claims than the great *shaykhs*, who were obliged by their own pretensions to reject such patronage. Thus Sufi *shaykh*s are stated to have been put in charge of 120 *khānaqāh*s endowed by the Sultan Fērōz Shāh Tughluq (regn. 1351–88) in the capital city of Delhi. With the three days' hospitality at each stop prescribed by Muslim tradition, Muslim travellers might spend 360 days or a whole year round in the capital city.[9] But if a major Sufi *shaykh* laid claims to *wilāyat* or spiritual rule over a territory which the Sultan held by the force of his arms and ordered through the civil administration, he could ill afford to be seen to be under the Sultan's patronage, as indicated by such gestures as accepting largesse, alms or grants, directly from the Sultan; or attending upon the Sultan at his court, which would involve the observance of court etiquette designed to emphasize the supremacy of the sovereign over all who attended; or even willingly permitting the Sultan to visit his own *khānaqāh*, with the *shaykh* receiving the Sultan with the same politeness as was the lot of other visitors.

From the point of view of the Sultan, the failure of the *shaykh* to perform such gestures might constitute a threat to his authority, because of the visible independence of the *shaykh* from that authority and the possibility that the *shaykh*'s *khānaqāh* might provide a refuge and a rallying point for dissidents and plotters against it.[10] Some Sultans may not have taken Sufi claims to *wilāyat* seriously, even though these are referred to in nearly contemporary chronicles as well as hagiographic sources. Nevertheless, such claims remained a source of vague and recurrent unease. That they could constitute a real threat to the power of a reigning Sultan was demonstrated by the conspiracy with the Shaykh Sīdī Muwallih as its figurehead in the reign of Jalāl al-Dīn Fērōz Khaljī (regn. 1290–6,[11] and by examples from later Indo-Muslim history and from elsewhere in the Islamic world.[12]

Niẓām al-Dīn "Awliyā" Chishtī (d. 1325), the most

powerful *shaykh* of the capital city at the time when the power of the Delhi Sultanate itself had attained its greatest extent at the beginning of the fourteenth century, was given by his followers the honorific of *Sulṭān al-mashā'ikh* ("the Sultan of *shaykhs*"). This regal imagery is pursued in a famous encomium on the Shaykh by the poet Amīr Khusraw:

An emperor in a *faqīr's* cell,
A "Refuge of the World" for the heart of the world,
A King of Kings without throne or crown,
With kings in need of the dust of his feet.[13]

It is accordingly no matter for surprise that the conflict between royal and Sufi claims of authority in this period of the Delhi sultanate centred around the person of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn. Four anecdotes in the *Siyar al-awliyā'*, a biographical source regarding Niẓām al-Dīn compiled within a generation of his death, illustrate the tensions which arose between the Shaykh and successive Sultans of Delhi.

1. The reign of Sultan Fērōz Shah Khaljī preceded the period of Niẓām al-Dīn's greatest influence in the capital city. Knowing the reluctance of the Shaykh to meet him, the Sultan conspired with the poet Amīr Khusraw, who was both a *murīd* (disciple) of the Shaykh and *muṣhafdār* (keeper of the Qur'ān) of the Sultan himself. The Sultan planned to go in the company of the poet and pay an unexpected call upon the Shaykh. Amīr Khusraw felt bound secretly to inform the Shaykh of this plan. Niẓām al-Dīn left Delhi immediately for a visit to the resting-place of his *pīr* (predecessor) at Ajodhan.[14]

2. In the reign of ʿAlā' al-Dīn Khaljī the influence of Nizām al-Dīn had reached its apogee and "*ʿulamā'*, *shaykh*s, *malik*s and *amīr*s were his servants." Envious people (*ḥāsidān*) described the lavishness of the hospitality which the Shaykh dispensed and brought such reports about him as led the Sultan, who (we are told) had a suspicious and vengeful nature, to fear that the Shaykh would bring injury to his rule, of the same kind as "others of this group (*ṭā'ifa*)" had brought to rulers in the past.[15]

The Sultan accordingly devised a ruse to ascertain whether the Shaykh had intentions of seizing power. He indited a letter to him to the effect that, since the Shaykh was the "Lord of Mankind" by whom people's needs were fulfilled and since God had given temporal power to the writer (the Sultan), it would be appropriate for him to submit to the Shaykh's judgement in matters arising in the kingdom.[16]

The Sultan sent the letter by the hand of his son Khiżr Khān, who was a *murīd* of the Shaykh and was not aware of the background to its dispatch. The Shaykh took the letter in his hand and remarked without studying it:

"What business have *darwēsh*s with the doings of Kings? I am a *darwēsh* who has made a retreat from the city, and I am occupied in praying for the King and for Muslims. If the King says anything further I will leave this place also."[17]

The Sultan ʿAlā' al-Dīn was much pleased with the answer that the prince brought back, and he remarked that he knew that all this had nothing to do with "the Sultan of Shaykhs" (i.e. with Niẓām al-Dīn himself), adding that this would have caused the ruin of his realm.

After this the Sultan announced his intention of visiting the Shaykh, who sent a message back that "there is no need to come." He himself was occupied with "prayer *in absentia*" (*duʿā-yi ghaybat*) and such prayer had peculiar efficacy. When after this message the Sultan continued to press him, the Shaykh pronounced:

"The house of this weak one has two doors. If the Sultan enters by one door, I will go out by the other!"[18]

3. According to the *Siyar al-awliyā'*, the youthful son and successor of ʿAlā' al-Dīn Khaljī, Sultan Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak (regn. 1316–20) was hostile to Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn for two reasons. The first was that the Sultan had built a congregational mosque (*masjid-i jāmiʿ*) at Sīrī (the most recent "New City" of Delhi).[19] On the first Friday (after its completion) he summoned all the *shaykh*s and *ʿulamā'* to offer their prayers there. Niẓām al-Dīn sent back an answer that he had a mosque close to him, and that it was more fitting that he should offer his prayers there.

The second reason was that all the *imām*s, *shaykh*s and other men of religion used to assemble on the first day of the month to offer their greetings to the Sultan. Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn did not go, but used to send his servant Iqbāl. This afforded an opportunity for "the envious" (*ḥāsidān*) to stir up trouble. The young Sultan in his pride said that if Niẓām al-Dīn did not come on the first of the month he would have him brought forcibly.[20]

Niẓām al-Dīn went to the tomb of his mother, who was buried in Delhi, and stated that the Sultan desired to injure him. If before the end of the month "his business was not settled" (*kār-i ū ba-kifāyat na-rasad*), he would not come to visit her then. The first of the month (it is explained) was the anniversary of the Shaykh's mother's death. After his return from this visit, as the first of the month drew near, Niẓām al-Dīn's followers became increasingly concerned; but the Shaykh deriving assurance from his submission of the matter to his mother, sat waiting for what the future had in store. On the last night before the beginning of the new month, Khusraw Khān, the favourite of the Sultan, treacherously cut off his head, throwing the Sultan's body down from the roof of the palace and setting the head on top of a lance to display it to the populace.[21]

4. The conflict between Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn and Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq (regn. 1320–5) has passed into folk tradition.[22] The background to the

quarrel is not adequately explained in our earliest main source, the *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, but the account of the early sixteenth-century *Siyar al-ʿārifīn* (whose author Jamālī customarily devotes more attention than his predecessor to the topic of the maintenance of *khānaqāh*s) is plausible.

After the murder of Sultan Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak, his usurping successor Khusraw Khān distributed large sums to *darwēsh*s in the city. Three *shaykh*s of note refused to receive these offerings; but Niẓām al-Dīn took the five *lakh*s of *tanka*s which he had been sent, and shared this sum out among the *faqīr*s and the deserving poor of the city. Other *shaykh*s who had received such sums from Khusraw Khān kept them in trust. After Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq defeated Khusraw Khān and ascended the throne, he sought to recover the donations which had left the treasury depleted. Niẓām al-Dīn argued that the sum he had received was from the *bayt al-māl* (the public treasury of Muslim believers) and he had therefore distributed it to the deserving, keeping nothing for himself. The Sultan was silenced by this reply, but his heart was turned against Niẓām al-Dīn.[23]

The sequel to this was that, at the instance of a hostile group motivated by envy (*ḥasad*), Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn allowed proceedings to be instituted, in which Niẓām al-Dīn had to defend the legitimacy, according to Muslim law, of his practice of *samāʿ* (listening to music). The accusers were led, according to Amīr Khwurd in the *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, by an immigrant *shaykhzāda* called Ḥusām al-Dīn, who had originally received hospitality from Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn; and by Qāżī Jalāl al-Dīn, who held the office of *Nāʾib Ḥākim* (Deputy Governor of the city).[24]

Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn was obliged to appear in person before a large gathering presided over by the Sultan himself. Amīr Khwurd says that this took place at the Sultan's palace (*dar-i sarāy-i bādshāh*), but Jamālī adds the detail that this was in the Sultan's new fortress of Tughluqābād in south Delhi.[25] The case was that *samāʿ* was unlawful according to the opinion of the *Imām* Abū Ḥanīfa. Arguments turned on whether *ḥadīth*s of the Prophet could be accepted which were not recognized by the Ḥanafī school of law. Evidence was given by Mawlānā ʿAlam al-Dīn, a grandson of the great Shaykh Bahāʾ al-Dīn Zakariyyāʾ of Multan. ʿAlam al-Din had written a treatise on the topic of the lawfulness of *samāʿ* and had travelled in "Baghdād and Shām and Rūm." He testified that *samāʿ* was practised by the *shaykh*s of those lands without prohibition. The Sultan then complied with Niẓām al-Dīn's request and refused to make a pronouncement upon the subject. According to a "less trustworthy source" also mentioned but not named by Amīr Khwurd, the Sultan pronounced *samāʿ* lawful for Niẓām al-Dīn, but not for others "like the group (*ṭāʾifa*) of the Qalandars and Ḥaydarīs."[26]

The effective outcome of the last incident was a check on the pretensions of the Shaykh. Niẓām al-Dīn had been compelled to appear at the Sultan's judicial inquest (*maḥżar*) and to submit to judgement. The humiliation was evidently mitigated by the Sultan's prudent consideration that the Shaykh and his followers should not be pressed to an extreme confrontation. One of the principal attackers, Qāżī Jalāl al-Din, had in the course of the proceedings uttered a threat that, if Niẓām al-Dīn continued to hold *samāʿ*, he would intervene by virtue of his office of *Nāʾib Ḥākim*. The Shaykh had replied that he should (i.e. would) be retired from that office. According to Amīr Khwurd, he was relieved of it twelve days later; this author adds that he soon "went on a journey" (i.e. died).[27] According to Jamālī, just after Niẓām al-Dīn had returned to his *khānaqāh* the news reached him that the Sultan was much ashamed, and had dismissed the Qāżī from his post as *Ḥākim*.[28]

In this Sufi ideology the imposition of the will of the Sulṭan against that of the Shaykh was unacceptable. For if the Sultan could act thus with impunity, the *wilāyat* of the Shaykh was cast into doubts in the minds of his followers. In the four accounts, surveyed above, of Niẓām al-Dīn's relations with four different Sultans of Delhi, the Shaykh's desire to avoid a meeting prevailed without a contest in the first two instances over the importunities of Jalāl al-Dīn Fērōz Khaljī and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Khaljī. In the third case the threat of compulsion by Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak leads to the brutal and exemplary death of the Sultan. But in the fourth case the Shaykh was in fact compelled to attend the Sultan's summons and hear his judgement. What would be the consequences of this?

Possibly, in an attempt to avert further trouble, the *Nāʾib Ḥākim*, who had been told by the Shaykh that he would be retired from his post, was so retired. Thus the *nafas* (pronouncement) of the Shaykh was not discredited.[29] Yet this retirement was not in itself a sufficiently momentous consequence of the flouting of the Shaykh's authority to satisfy his devotees.

Predictably, the *Siyar al-awliyāʾ* reproduces remarks of the Shaykh after the conclusion of the inquest (*maḥżar*). Surprisingly, they are said to be taken from a now lost work of the main contemporary historian of the Delhi sultanate, the *Ḥasrat-nāma* ("Book of Regret") of Żiyāʾ al-Dīn Baranī. After the Shaykh had returned home, he summoned Baranī together with Mawlānā Muḥyī al-Dīn Kāshānī and the poet Amīr Khusraw at the time of the midday prayer. He said that the men of learning were filled with envy and enmity, and had found the field open. In "our city" (Delhi) the narrations of *fiqh* had been preferred to *ḥadīth*; and *ḥadīth* of the Shāfiʿī school had been ignored. What would be the fate of a city where such insolence was committed? How could it flourish? It would be strange if it was not reduced to a pile of

bricks! As a result of the wickedness of the unsound faith of the *ʿulamāʾ*, upon the city there would rain from heaven calamity and exile, famine and plague.

In the view of the writer, the comminations of the Shaykh were amply fulfilled. Within four years of the event, all the *ʿulamāʾ* who were in that *maḥẓar*, and others because of them, were exiled to Devgīr (Dawlatābād). Most of them set out for Devgīr, and a mortal famine and epidemic appeared in the city (of Delhi).[30] These calamities were not at an end at the time of writing.[31] Every word that had been spoken by the blessed tongue of *Ḥaẓrat Sulṭān al-mashāʾikh* (Niẓām al-Dīn) had come to pass.[32]

The *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, which includes this notice of the fate of the *ʿulamāʾ* who participated in the *maḥẓar* and of the city of Delhi itself, has no mention of the fate which befell Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq. He was killed by the collapse of a pavilion of welcome after a victorious campaign, one stage away from the capital to which he was returning. The pavilion was erected by his son and successor Muḥammad bin Tughluq, and some contemporaries considered that its collapse was not accidental.[33] The silence of the *Siyar al-awliyāʾ* regarding this event may have been a political one, as the work was mostly written in the reign of a sovereign of the dynasty who honoured the memory of his kinsman and predecessors.[34]

The death of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq gave rise to one of the best known stories regarding Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn, and to a popular proverb of which the Urdu translation is still current: "Delhi is yet far away! (*hanōz Delhī dūr ast*)" The Sultan, on his return from a victorious campaign in the east was threatening a further reckoning with the Shaykh, who is said to have made this pronouncement (*nafas*). The earliest clear reference to the Shaykh uttering the sentence is in the chronicle of Sihrindī, written just over a century later.[35] Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who was in Delhi a decade after the event, ascribes the statement to astrologers, but he reports that Niẓām al-Dīn in an ecstasy had already bestowed the kingdom on Muḥammad bin Tughluq. It is possible that the association of the Shaykh with the sentence had already been made, but Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, as elsewhere, had misunderstood or misremembered the narrative of his informant.[36]

In spite of this anecdote of Niẓām al-Dīn's premature approval of the new ruler, relations between Sufi *shaykhs* and the reigning Sultan of Delhi reached a nadir in the reign of Muḥammad bin Tughluq 1325–51). Muḥammad bin Tughluq's harsh treatment of *shaykhs*, some examples of which are vividly described by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, continued for many years without injury to himself;[37] but in the opinion of the author of the *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, it ultimately led to his comfortless death in a distant land.

Amīr Khwurd observes that at the beginning of the Sultan's rule, when the kingdom of Hindostan attained a great expansion, he caused injuries to Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd (Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn's *khalīfa* or successor at Delhi), who "in the opinion of everybody" was the Shaykh of his age, and was obeyed by the whole population. Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, following the example of his *pīrs* (the great Chishtī *shaykhs*), thought it proper to endure all this and did not strive for retribution, until the time when this king at the end of his life went to Thattha, which is a thousand *karōhs* away from Delhi, on the campaign against the rebel Ṭāghī.[38] From there he summoned Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd together with *ʿulamāʾ* and holy men (from the capital of Delhi) to join him, and he did not show to them the respect that they deserved. Transporting them thus brought the king from the throne (*takht*) of sultanate to the planks (*takhta*) of the bier on which he was borne back to the city (of Delhi).[39]

Devout contemporaries sought for explanations of the lack of immediate retribution upon Sultan Muḥammad bin Tughluq for his persecution of Sufi *shaykhs* and in particular for his coercion of Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, "the lamp of Delhi." The Shaykh himself, it is recorded, saw the Sultan's persecution as God's punishment for some undisclosed fault of his own. "There was a matter between me and God. For that I suffered this."[40]. The view of a fellow-*khalīfa* of Niẓām al-Dīn, the aged Shaykh Burhān al-Dīn at Dawlatābād, was that the lack of divine retribution upon the Sultan was the result of Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd's mild and forgiving character:

"When (Burhān al-Dīn Gharīb) heard of the impolitenesses (*bē-adabīhā*) which Sultan Muḥammad had committed against the Shaykh he wept and said: "What can I do? Khond Mawlānā Maḥmūd (Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd) is mild and generous. At this time if he wishes he could bring down the whole of the army and the people and the horses and elephants, not arousing grief'."[41]

Half-a-century later and from the point of view of a hagiographer of the rival Firdawsī *silsila*, it was the misconduct of Sultan Fērōz Shāh Tughluq (regn. 1351–88) and of the *shaykhs*, *ʿulamāʾ* and population of the city of Delhi in putting to death two disciples of Shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn Manērī which brought about the sequence of events of the downfall of the greater Delhi sultanate.[42] When the news of the execution of his disciples reached Sharaf al-Dīn (in Bihār), he said:

"In a city where they have shed the blood of such holy men—it would be strange if such a city continued to flourish!"

It happened as he said. The ruin began in Fērōz Shāh's lifetime. For all his pomp, the Sultan lost control in the city itself. The son of the Sultan (i.e. Prince Muḥammad Shāh) fought with the *Wazīr* Khān-i Jahān. Many Muslims were killed in the incident and the city faced ruin. Then the royal slaves seized Delhi and fought with the son of the Sultan.

After this, the Mughals (i.e. Amīr Timur with his army) came and turned Delhi upside down.[43]

Though one may reject the explanation of the cause of the débâcle as being Shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn's displeasure, this is an accurate brief summary of the course of events in the capital city of Delhi in the years from 1387 to 1398.[44]

II SUFIS AND KINGMAKING: THE *SHAYKH* AS THE BESTOWER OF THE SULTAN'S GOOD FORTUNE IN THE DELHI SULTANATE

The corollary of the belief repeatedly visible in the narratives quoted above, that an offence against a Sufi *shaykh* will lead to the downfall of a ruler, is the belief that such *shaykhs* also had the power to bestow kingship upon individuals whom they encountered, or to foresee the attainment of a throne by such men. Such a belief is more likely to flourish in a society where there is no strong tradition of primogeniture or hereditary rule, and usurpations of power are common. This power attributed to Sufi *shaykhs* is one of the stock images of Persian poets of the period, among them Ḥāfiẓ:

dalq-i gadā-yi ʿishq-rā ganj buvad dar āstīn zūd ba-salṭanat rasad
harki buvad gadā-yi tu[45]

"The cloak of the beggar of love has a treasure in its sleeve;
Anyone who is your beggar swiftly attains sovereignty."

In India, during the Delhi sultanate and later, recorded examples of the bestowal of kingship by Sufis are numerous. The earliest anecdote is of the first decade of the thirteenth century. Ḥusām al-Dīn ʿAważ Khaljī, who overran Bengal in the aftermath of the initial conquest of Delhi, while he was travelling with a laden ass in the hilly region of modern Afghanistan between Zawulistan and Ghor, was told by two *faqīrs*:

"O Chief, go to Hindōstān! We give you the country as far as Islam has spread!"[46]

Such good fortune was less impressive if it was bestowed upon a prince who could claim to be legitimate heir to a throne. In recollection and in folk tradition, such anecdotes were particularly liable to be attached to slaves who rose to the throne; and this was the condition of the *mamlūk* or Slave Sultans of thirteenth-century Delhi. Jūzjānī, the chronicler who related the previous anecdote, records an anecdote of the second independent Sultan of Delhi, Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish (regn. 1210–35). Jūzjānī states that he heard the story from a trustworthy witness who had heard it from the lips of the Sultan himself:

As a boy-slave at Bukhara, the future Sultan was sent out to purchase grapes. In the street he lost the money and started to cry. A *faqīr* took his hand, bought some grapes, and told him:

"When you attain rule and dominion, take care that you show respect to *faqīrs* and holy folk!"

The Sultan added:

"I swore this to him, and the good fortune and rule that I have attained, I have attained from the glance of that *darwēsh*!"[47]

A fourteenth-century source relates an alternative bestowal of kingship upon the same Sultan. When Qāżī Ḥamīd al-Dīn Nagawrī (the Suhrawardī friend of the Chishtī *shaykh* Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtyār Kākī) came to Delhi, he was in *samāʿ* (musical parties) day and night, until the *ʿulamāʾ* arraigned him and made Sultan Iltutmish ask him for justification. Qāżī Ḥamīd stated that he and the Sultan used to be in the same assemblies in Baghdad, with the Qāżī all night in *samāʿ* and *raqṣ* (dancing). The Sultan was the little slave-boy who stood all night by the lamp with a pair of scissors to trim the wick.

darān shab turā mulk-i Hindōstān
bidādand z-ān chākarī ʿārifān

"On that night for that service the 'knowers' (*ʿārifān*, mystics) gave you the kingdom of Hindōstān."[48]

Yet another story of a bestowal of tidings of future kingship upon Iltutmish exists in four differing versions of varying degrees of elaboracy. The earliest exists in the conversations of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn, told by him in 1309. The incident must be presumed, from the personages, to have been set in Baghdad like the conferral recorded by ʿIṣāmī reproduced above.[49] Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn's previous remarks in his conversation had been about Sultan Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish. After that he made another remark about him.

He had met with Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī and Shaykh Awḥad Kirmānī, and one of them had said to him, "You will be a King!"[50]

In the early sixteenth century, Jamālī sought to attach this information to another anecdote related by Jūzjānī of the purchase of Iltutmish by the trader Khwāja al-Dīn, who took him to sell in India. At the age of fifteen, when he had discretion, the future Sultan passed before the *khānaqāh* of Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī, and his gaze fell upon the Shaykh. Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī was also present. The boy entered the *khānaqāh* and offered some broken pieces (of precious metal) from his waistband, asking for a recitation of the *Fātiḥa*. After the recitation, Shihāb al-Dīn said:

"I see the light of sultanate shining in the face of this fellow!"

Awḥad al-Dīn added:

"From your *baraka* during his worldly rule his faith will remain intact."[51]

Long before Jamālī's embellishments, another hagiographical tradition had transferred the credit of this bestowal to the first of the Chishtī *shaykhs* in India, Muʿīn al-Dīn. The transfer is first made by a less scrupulous source, one of the spurious collections of *Malfūẓāt* of the line of Chishtī *shaykhs* produced in direct and almost immediate imitation of the *Fawāʾid al-fuʾād*.[52] The narration is (falsely) attributed to Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtyār Kākī who has figured in previous anecdotes:

Shaykh Muᶜīn al-Dīn Ḥasan Sijzī, Shaykh Awḥad Kirmānī, Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī and I myself were sitting together and we were telling tales of past saints. Sultan Shams al-Dīn—may God illuminate his proofs—was then twelve years old and at that moment passed by with a cup in his hand. The glance of those holy men fell upon him, and straightaway a pronouncement (*nafas*) came out from the tongue of Shaykh Muᶜīn al-Dīn Ḥasan Sijzī:

"This child will be King of Delhi. God will not take him from the world till he reaches kingship."

Then the *khwāja* (Quṭb al-Dīn) remarked:

"The tidings (*nafas*) of holy men are a fine thing!"[53]

We may note that the author of this narrative (pseudo-Farīd al-Dīn) has made the recipient more of a child (*kōdak*), three years younger than the youthful warrior with some savings to offer the Shaykh as he appears in Jamālī's version. To achieve kingship at this period he needs must have been a slave, and the cup (*kāsa*) in his hand would indicate that he was employed as a youthful cupbearer (*sāqī*).

The seventeenth-century Chishtī hagiography *Siyar al-aqṭāb* also gives the credit for these "tidings" to Muᶜīn al-Dīn;

One day Muᶜīn al-Dīn was sitting in the company of Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī and Shihāb al-Dīn ᶜUmar Suhrawardī. Suddenly the future Sultan passed by with a bow and arrow in his hand.

"My friends!", Muᶜīn al-Dīn observed, "this child will be Sultan of Delhi, for I have seen in the tablet (of the heavens) that he will not leave the world until he becomes Sultan of Delhi."[54]

This anecdote has added a touch of grandeur to its predecessor, with the Shaykh looking at the "preserved tablet" of the heavens, while the bow and arrow, substituted for the cup in the preceding source, suitably prefigure a military career.

In the case of the next slave to attain the throne of Delhi, Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balban (regn. 1266–87), two accounts of the bestowal of kingship resemble those related with regard to the choice by *faqīr*s of Iltutmish in his boyhood. In Delhi or in Bukhara the boy-slave Balban made an offering to a *faqīr*, who then bestowed the realm of Hindōstān upon him. The offering was a copper coin and the place of the incident was Delhi, according to the story told to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in Delhi itself in the third decade of the fourteenth century.[55] It was in Bukhara, and the gift was a pomegranate according to the verse chronicle of ᶜIṣāmī, who wrote in the Deccan some twenty years after the Arab traveller heard the story in Delhi.[56]

A third account, also recorded in the fourteenth century, regarding the bestowal of kingship on Balban, when the latter was not a slave-boy but a powerful and ambitious general, is found in the *Siyar al-awliyā*ᵓ. The incident is historically plausible and is an indication of the growing influence of the Chishtī *silsila* in the period in which it is set, the middle of the thirteenth century. The account is of the future Sultan's visit to Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn at Ajodhan. Balban, then known by the title of Ulugh Khān, was defending the western marches of the Delhi sultanate against the incursions of the Mongols. He cherished an ambition to succeed the reigning Sultan, his father-in-law Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd. Ulugh Khān offered the Shaykh a sum of silver and the grants (*mithāl*) of four villages. Farīd accepted the silver but not the grants. Balban then demanded some statement of "what the Shaykh had in mind." Farīd al-Dīn replied with a suitably oracular pronouncement. He recited two couplets of Persian verse, which might be interpreted as an injunction to the inquirer to rule well should he attain to power in spite of evident imperfections of character ("he was no angel"). According to the *Siyar al-awliyā*ᵓ this answer appears to have pleased the future usurper.[57]

Perhaps the most powerful of all the Sultans of Delhi was ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn Khaljī (regn. 1295–1316), who murdered his uncle and usurped the throne. The fourteenth-century verse chronicle of ᶜIṣāmī, which draws a significant amount of its material from folk tradition, records that he received two nominations to sovereignty from the wilder *bē-shar*ᶜ end of the spectrum of Sufi behaviour. ᶜIṣāmī's first anecdote is of a madman known (possibly in mockery) as Qāżī ᶜĀlam, who was in the habit of throwing stones from a balcony in the same town of Karra, an important southern frontier town close to modern Allahabad, and of wandering through the bazaar there with an African servant cracking a whip. He proffered a ring to ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn who was passing by, and proclaimed that the realm of Hindōstān was bestowed upon him.[58] The gesture of this *darwēsh* seems to be a remote reminiscence of the divine investiture of the Sasanian rulers of Iran by the bestowal of a ring or wreath;[59] a similar gesture by a *darwēsh* is also recorded in eleventh-century Iran.[60] The second bestowal was from the *majdhūb* or madman known as Khwāja Gurg ("Wolf"), also of the town of Karra. Gurg greeted the future Sultan as he rode up to the shop-platform where he was seated, remarking that God had made him the rider of Fortune (*dawlat*, also the power of the state).[61]

Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq is said in a contemporary poem to have been nominated to the throne by a unnamed *pīr* whom he saw in a dream. It may have been politic of Amīr Khusraw not to name the *pīr*.[62] In modern oral tradition of the Panjab, "Bābā" Farīd al-Dīn is said to have nominated this monarch, evidently many decades before the fulfilment of the prophecy.[63]

Regarding Ghiyāth al-Dīn's son and successor Muḥammad bin Tughluq, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, a contemporary foreign observer, records the belief that Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn while in a state of ecstasy had said:

"We have given him the kingdom!"[64]

At the time when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa was in Delhi, the worst troubles between Sultan Muḥammad bin Tughluq and the Sufi *shaykh*s were just beginning. It is not surprising that this anecdote is not found in later Chishtī sources.[65]

Nominations to sovereignty by Sufi *shaykhs* continue in the period from the later fourteenth century to the sixteenth century. In the case of the last major ruler of the greater Delhi Sultanate, Sultan Fērōz Shāh Tughluq, the panegyrical historian of his reign, Shams-i Sirāj ᶜAfīf, presents the Sultan himself in the guise of a holy man. ᶜAfīf provides a predictably ornate version of the bestowal of kingship on his subject. He derives the ascent of the throne by Sultan Fērōz Shāh from the "tidings" (*bashārāt*) spoken by four different Sufi *shaykhs*. This multiplicity itself perhaps reflects the vogue among later fourteenth-century Sufis for acquiring a plurality of spiritual lineages, becoming a "gatherer of the threads" (*jāmiᶜ al-salāsil*).[66] The structure of each of the four anecdotes given by ᶜAfīf has analogues elsewhere in the corpus of Sufi anecdotal literature. ᶜAfīf sets their patterns beside one another with the somewhat ingenuous artistry which is characteristic of his whole composition:

1. *The Tidings of Shaykh ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn, grandson of Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn*

When Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq (uncle of Fērōz Shāh) was *muqṭaᶜ* (Governor) of Dīpālpūr, he went to meet Shaykh ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn (at Ajodhan). The Shaykh had in front of him a roll of unsewn cloth. He tore four-and-a-half yards (*gaz*) from the cloth and gave it to Sultan Tughluq, telling him to tie it around his head. He gave twenty-seven yards to Sultan Muḥammad and forty yards to Sultan Fērōz, to be tied around their heads. As a result of the pronouncements of the Shaykh, they each ruled for the corresponding number of years. After this, as the Shaykh had given the whole of the remainder of the roll to Sultan Fērōz, the kingdom came to an end with him. "After his departure (death), this city of Delhi came to an end, that is to say, it was sacked."

2. *The Tidings heard from the tongue of Shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn (Būᶜ Alī Qalandar) of Panipat*

When the same three members of the Tughluq dynasty went to meet Shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn, the Shaykh ordered his servitors (*khādimān*) to bring food in a bowl (*kāsa*). When all three of his visitors put their hands into the bowl, Shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn said:

"Three kings are eating from one bowl!"

3. *The Tidings from the tongue of Niẓām al-Dīn*

In the days when Sultan Fērōz was a little boy, he went to kiss the Shaykh's feet (i.e. to pay his respects to the Shaykh) in Ghiyāthpūr. The Shaykh was much pleased by the greeting of Fērōz.

"My boy (*bābā*), what's your name?" the Shaykh asked.

"Kamāl al-Dīn," the future Sultan replied.

Sultan Fērōz had the *laqab* (honorific name) Kamāl al-Dīn ("Perfection of the Faith"). When the Shaykh heard this, he immediately pronounced:

"Life to perfection (i.e. a long life)! Fortune (*dawlat*, implying sovereignty) to perfection! Grace (*niᶜmat*) to perfection!"[67]

4. *The Tidings from Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd*

When Sultan Muḥammad was pursuing the rebel Ṭāghī to Thattha in Sind,[68] he took Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd in his entourage. After Sultan Muḥammad's death in Thattha, Sultan Fērōz ascended the throne. Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd sent him a message, asking him if he was going to rule his people justly? Otherwise, another ruler would be requested from God (i.e. by the prayers of the Shaykh). Sultan Fērōz sent the reply that he would observe clemency (*ḥilm*) and act with the consensus (*ittifāq*). When the Shaykh heard this, he sent an answer that, if the Sultan behaved with such humanity towards the people, he would ask for forty years (of life and rule) for him from God.

ᶜAfīf here notes that some people told the story that Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd sent thirty-nine dates to the Sultan (i.e. one for each year of future rule beyond the current year). His notice concludes:

"Hurrah for Tidings upon Tidings!"[69]

This last anecdote anticipates a trend, visible in the following century and later, of *shaykhs* participating in the public acknowledgement or enthronement of Sultans.

Among the successor states to the greater Delhi sultanate we have evidence of traditions of such nominations. Sufi *shaykhs* and their actual or alleged bestowals of kingship also played a considerable part in determining the rise to power of the new ruling dynasties and the succession among their members.

In Bengal, the first area to break away from the control of the Delhi Sultans in the fourteenth century ᶜAlī Mubārak, the future Sultan ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn ᶜAli- Shāh (regn. in West Bengal 1339–46) saw Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī, who promised him rule over "the province of Bang" if he should build him a *khānaqāh* at Pandwa.[70]

The chronicles of fifteenth-century Gujarāt mention the nomination of the founder of the ruling house,

Ẓafar Khān, by the Suhrawardī Bukhārī *shaykh* from Ucch, Jalāl al-Dīn "Makhdūm-i Jahāniyān", a prominent Sufi of the latter years of Fērōz Shāh Tughluq's reign.[71] In the course of the fifteenth century, some of Jalāl al-Dīn's descendants settled in Gujarāt and intermarried with the ruling family. According to one possibly partial source, among these descendants of Jalāl al-Dīn, Shāh ᶜĀlam of Sarkhej played a decisive part in the events which led to the succession in 1458 of Maḥmūd Begaṛhā, the greatest of the Gujarāt Sultans. Maḥmūd Begaṛhā was both a nephew by marriage and a stepson of this *shaykh*.[72] The "Bukhārī *Sayyids*", descendants of Jalāl al-Dīn, participated in a rite of enthronement. Thus in 1554 Sayyid Mubārak Bukhārī, a descendant of "*Makhdūm-i Jahāniyān*", led the boy king Aḥmad III up to the throne.[73]

In the Deccan, the mid-fourteenth century founder of the Bahmanī dynasty, Ḥasan Kāngū, is said to have received "tidings" of his future sovereignty from Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn of Delhi. The Shaykh had given a general invitation to a feast at the *khānaqāh*, in which the future Sultan Muḥammad bin Tughluq had shared. As he left the Shaykh pronounced:

"A Sultan has gone and a Sultan is coming!"[74]

The Shaykh then ordered his servitor to bring in a man standing at the gate. After hesitating when he saw his shabby clothes, the servitor brought in Ḥasan Kāngū. As the food of the feast had already been distributed, Niẓām al-Dīn gave him a round of bread which he pronounced to be an umbrella (*chatr*) of sovereignty which would long endure.[75]

Other sources ascribe the promotion of Ḥasan Kāngū to the *baraka* of a *shaykh* established in the western Deccan, Shaykh Sirāj al-Dīn Junaydī, whose *murīd* Ḥasan became.[76] Sirāj al-Dīn is said to have placed his turban in Ḥasan's hands, and when the latter placed it upon his own head, the Shaykh said that he would wear a royal crown. He also revealed the site of a buried treasure, instructing Ḥasan to raise an army with it.[77] Sirāj al-Dīn's successors at Gulbarga claimed that their lineage had conferred sovereignty on the Bahmanī Sultans.[78] Following the example of their ancestor they invested successive Sultans with a turban, a tunic and a girdle of coarse (*khādī*) cloth.[79] When the garments of investiture were treated with disrespect by Sultan Maḥmūd Bahmanī (regn. 1482–1518), the last powerful ruler of the dynasty, these are said to have been bestowed by the incumbent *shaykh* on Yūsuf ᶜĀdil Khāh, founder of the new ruling house of the Sultans of Bījāpūr.[80]

Following the sack of Delhi in 1398, the last great Chishtī *shaykh* of the Delhi sultanate, Sayyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz, came to settle in the Bahmanī capital of Gulbarga and played a decisive role in the succession of Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī (Aḥmad I) in 1422.[81] The latter monarch, in order to support his authority, within a few years imported from Iran the heirs of another *shaykh* of similar attributes and powerful reputation, Shāh Niᶜmat Allāh of Māhān. The historical record is clear that it was largely through the support of Gēsūdarāz that Aḥmad I was victorious over his brother the reigning Sultan Fērōz, and set aside the claims of his nephew Ḥasan; but Aḥmad later claimed that his elevation to the throne had been preceded by a dream in which Shāh Niᶜmat Allāh Walī of Kirman had with his own hands offered to him the royal crown. The dream was followed (probably years later) by a letter of investiture from this *shaykh*.[82] Sultan Aḥmad himself claimed the Sufi rank of *Walī*, and his heirs retained this title down to the end of the dynasty.[83] As was the case with the Muslim ruling house of Gujarāt, Sufi *shaykhs* played a prominent part in the enthronement ceremony of the Bahmanī Sultans of the Deccan.[84]

[1] S. Digby, "The Sufi Shaikh as a Source of Authority in Mediaeval India", *Puruṣârtha* IV (Paris, 1986) [= Digby 1986 (1)], pp. 55–77.

[2] See Digby 1986 (1), pp. 62–3.

[3] Baranī, *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī* (Calcutta, 1862), p. 325. Badāyūnī, *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh* (Calcutta, 1868), I, p. 266. Cf. also Baranī's remarks on the protective influence of Niẓām al-Dīn's predecessor Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn, and of other great *shaykhs* during the reign of Sultan Balban (1266–87); Barani, *TFS*, p. 112.

[4] I.e. the next world.

[5] ᶜIṣāmī, *Futūḥ al-salāṭīn*, ed. A. S. Usha (Madras, 1948), p. 456.

[6] Amīr Ḥasan ᶜAlāʾ Sijzī, *Fawāʾid al-fuʾād* (Lahore, 1966), p. 185.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 374.

[8] Amīr Khwurd, *Siyar al-awliyāʾ* (Delhi, A. H. 1302), p. 518.

[9] ᶜAfīf, *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī* (Calcutta, 1891), pp. 330–1. Regarding the establishment of such official *khānaqāhs*, Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn remarked that he had been appointed *Shaykh al-Islām* of Sind-Sīwistān by Sultan Muḥammad b. Tughluq and had been given charge of forty *khānaqāhs*; but he went on *Ḥajj* and spent six years in the Holy Places (Ḥaramayn); ᶜAlāʾ al-Dīn Ḥusayni, *Khulāṣat al-alfāẓ*, Digby Ms 11, folios 481b–482a; Ghulām Sarwar, *Khazīnat al-aṣfiyāʾ* (Lucknow, 1914), II, p. 58.

[10] That such ascetics, retired from the world and disclaiming worldly ambitions, should be a focus for the plots of those disaffected towards the ruler is taken for granted in an anecdote of the *Kitāb al-Tāj* of pseudo-Jāḥiẓ, composed in Baghdad under the ᶜAbbāsids. We are told that the Sasanian monarch Khusraw Parwīz caused a foster-brother to set up as such a holy man, in order to act as *agent-provocateur* towards those disaffected against the monarch's rule; see Ch. Pellat, tr., *Le livre de la couronne* (Paris, 1954), pp. 125–7. Cf. Digby 1986 (1), pp. 66–7 for fears said to have been expressed by an unnamed Sultan of Delhi regarding Mawlānā Ashraf al-Dīn Ṭawwāma that "from the excess of the obedience of the population . . . he might seize the realm."

[11] Baranī, *TFS*, 209–12; ᶜIṣāmī, 215–17. Among modern secondary works, see S. H. Hodivala, *Studies in Indo-Muslim History* (Bombay, 1939), I. pp. 267–8; K. A. Nizami, *Some Aspects of Politics and Religion in India During the Thirteenth Century* (Aligarh, 1961), pp. 288–91; Digby, "Qalandars and Related Groups: Elements of

Social Deviance in the Religious Life of the Delhī Sultanate of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries", in Y. Friedmann, ed., *Islam in Asia* (Jerusalem, 1984), I. pp. 67–8 [= Digby 1984]. Even in this case, the Sultan's treatment of the Shaykh was thought by near-contemporaries to have had dire consequences for the realm. We are told that a black wind arose on the day of Sīdī Muwallih's death, and both Baranī and ʿIṣāmī attribute the subsequent drought and famine at Delhi and in neighbouring areas to his death. Baranī also ascribes the subsequent troubles of the realm of the Khaljī Sultans to the misfortune of his death.

[12] Examples outside India of Sufi lineages assuming royal powers include the Ṣafavids of Iran, descendants of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ardabīlī, the Naqshbandī *khwājas* who displaced the Khāns of the Eastern Horde in eastern Turkistan in the seventeenth century, and the Qaramanlus of Anatolia in the thirteenth century (see Neshrī, *Cihannuma* (Ankara, 1949), I, pp. 42–2). In the middle of the nineteenth century, the *Ākhond* dynasty rose to power in Swat. Among unsuccessful Sufi contenders for thrones one may cite: the *faqīr* Shaydā in Bengal in the mid-fourteenth century, see Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Riḥla*, tr. M. Hussain (Baroda, 1953), p. 237; (Beirut, 1964), p. 612; Shāh Jalāl Gujarātī, put to death for his royal pretensions by a Sultan of Bengal in the fifteenth century, see ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Dehlavī, *Akhbār al-akhyār* (Delhi, A. H. 1309), p. 168; and the late eighteenth-century *sajjāda-nashīns* of Farīd al-Dīn Chishtī at Pakpattan, who fought the Sikh *misls* at the head of their own levies of tribal devotees, see S. M. Latif, *History of the Punjab*, (Lahore, 1892), p. 313, and Richard M. Eaton, "The Political and Religious Authority of the Shrine of Bābā Farīd", in B. Metcalf, ed., *Moral Conduct and Authority: the Place of Adab in South Asian Islam* (Berkeley, 1984), p. 350.

[13] Amīr Khusraw Dehlavī, *Majnūn Laylā*, ed. M. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān Khān (Aligarh, 1917), p. 13; *idem*, *Khamsa*, ed. A.A. Ashrafī (Tehran, 1362 Shamsī), p. 150; quoted by Amīr Khwurd at the head of his notice of "the coming of the Kings of the time as beggars to the court of the Sultan of Shaykhs Niẓām al-Dīn", *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, 130.

[14] *Ibid.*, 135. For the transmission of authority in the Chishtī *silsila* of the Delhi sultanate, see Digby, "*Tabarrukāt* and Succession Among the Great Chishtī Shaykhs of the Delhi Sultanate", in R. E. Frykenberg, ed., *Delhi Through the Ages* (Delhi, 1986) [= Digby 1986 (2)], 63–103; and Digby, 1986 (1), pp. 69–71.

[15] This appears to be an oblique reference to the conspiracy around Sīdī Muwallih in the previous reign. *Ṭāʾifa* is not used in the specific sense assigned to it in the historical scheme of J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (Oxford, 1971); for animadversions on this scheme, see Digby's review in *BSOAS* XXXVI, (1973), pp. 136–7. The *maliks* and *amīrs* of the quotation above were major and minor grades of officers of the sultanate, in theory commandants of 1,000 and 100.

[16] An anecdote narrated by Baranī indicates that ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn had some faith in the paranormal powers of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn. The Sultan, not having had news for forty days of the fate of the army which he had despatched in the autumn of 1309 to Warangal in the eastern Deccan under his slave-general Malik Nāʾib (Malik Kāfūr), sent two of his high officials to Niẓām al-Dīn to find out how they had fared from the Shaykh's powers of discovery (*kashf u karāmat*). The Shaykh prophesied their victorious return, and further victories thereafter; Baranī, *TFS*, pp. 330–2. A lengthier account of this consultation of the Shaykh by the Sultan, with the names of intermediaries and other apparently circumstantial details, is given by Jamālī, *Siyar al-ʿārifīn* (Delhi, A.H. 1311), pp. 78–9. For Jamālī's credibility, see notes 21, 25, 51 below.

Another incident shows amicable relations between Sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn and the Shaykh. When there was grave trouble from the Mongols (*malāʿīn*, "the accursed ones"), Sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn sent a messenger to Niẓām al-Dīn, telling him to come within the city walls of Delhi, and the Shaykh is shown as about to move into the city on the morrow or the day after that; Ḥamīd Qalandar, *Khayr al-majālis*, ed. Nizami (Aligarh, 1959), pp. 261–2. The most likely occasion for this incident is just before the battle of Kili in 1299.

[17] "This place also" refers to Niẓām al-Dīn's previous removal from the city to the suburb of Ghiyāthpūr, not far distant; see Digby, 1986 (1), p. 68.

[18] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, pp. 132–5; cf. Jamālī, *Siyar al-ʿārifīn*, p. 74.

[19] This reference suggests that the completion of the large Begampuri mosque at Siri, traditionally ascribed to the later fourteenth century, should be dated to this reign.

[20] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, pp. 150–1. Baranī gives a more general account of the growth of the hostility of the Sultan towards the Shaykh. The prospect of the downfall of the Sultan, he remarks, became as clear as day to observers when he began to abuse Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn and to forbid the *maliks* of his court to visit Niẓām al-Dīn at Ghiyāthpūr. Time and again in divers forms of intoxication, he said with the tongue of recklessness that he would give a thousand *ṭankas* of gold to the man who brought the head of Niẓām al-Dīn. Then he met Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn at the recitation on the third day after death in the enclosure of Shaykh Żiyāʾ al-Dīn Rūmī, where the Sultan did not show courtesy towards the Shaykh nor acknowledge his salutation. Wishing to pick a quarrel with the Shaykh, he took as a companion the *Shaykhzāda* of Jām, who was an enemy of Niẓām al-Dīn, and summoned the *Shaykh al-Islām* Rukn al-Dīn of Multan to the capital city; Baranī, *TFS*, p. 396. The Baranī variant has a briefer account of the Sultan's hostility to Niẓām al-Dīn, the "Pole-star of the world and Kaʿba of its inhabitants"; Digby Ms 57, f. 144. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa gives the name of the *Shaykhzāda* of Jām as Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn, with a lengthy account of his imprisonment and death at the hands of Muḥammad bin Tughluq; *Riḥla*, III, pp. 293–8; tr. Gibb, III, pp. 697–700. This *Shaykhzāda* must therefore be distinguished from the *Shaykhzāda* Ḥusām al-Dīn who a few years later played a part in the proceedings against Niẓām al-Dīn before Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq; see note 24 below.

[21] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, p. 151. For other accounts of relations between Sultan Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak and Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn, see Ḥamīd Qalandar, *Khayr al-majālis*, p. 258; Jamālī, *Siyar al-ʿārifīn*, pp. 74–5, 75–8. Jamālī tells the same story of the conflict between Sultan and Shaykh with the same outcome, at greater length with circumstantial details, some of which conflict with those of the earlier source; cf. notes 16, 25, 51.

[22] See below, p. 76.

[23] *Siyar al-ʿārifīn*, p. 88. For the theory of the *bayt al-māl* or public treasury and of distribution to the needy from it, see N. P. Aghnides, *Mohammedan Theories of Finance* (repr. Lahore, 1961), pp. 431–79; cf. I. H. Qureshi, *The Administration of the Sultanate of Delhī*, 4th ed. (Karachi, 1958), pp. 241–2, quoting ʿAfīf.

[24] Another early source mentions as leaders of the faction who compiled the *maḥżar* (legal judgement) the grandson of Qāżī Minhāj (the 13th century historian Jūzjānī, compiler of the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*) and the *Shaykh al-Islām*; Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī, *Maktūbāt-i Ashrafī*, BM [BL] Ms Or. 267, f. 129b. With regard to the part played by this immigrant *Shaykhzāda*, the title itself is faintly derogatory though evidently current at the Sultan's court, cf. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Riḥla*, tr. Husain, pp. 71, 89, 173; cf. also note 20 above. It is evident from Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's narrative of his Indian travels, and from the conversations of Sayyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz and from other references, that hostility existed between the numerous foreigners from the lands of Islam who sought their fortunes at the court of the fourteenth-century Delhi Sultans and the old established Muslim families of the capital city; see Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Riḥla*, tr. Husain, p. 107, and note 1; Baranī, *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī*, pp. 461–2; Sayyid Muḥammad Akbar Ḥusaynī, *Jawāmiʿ al-kalim* (Kanpur-Hyderabad, Intiẓāmī Press, 1352 Faṣlī), p. 136; Sihrindī, *Taʾrīkh-i Mubārakshāhī*, p. 107.

[25] *Siyar al-ʿārifīn* (Calcutta, 1931), pp. 88–9. This is not improbable, but Jamālī is inclined to fill out from imagination or conjecture rather than from another tradition the details of anecdotes from earlier sources; see Digby 1984, p. 93.

[26] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, pp. 526–30. For the Qalandars and Ḥaydarīs and the problems posed by them, see Digby 1984, especially pp. 72–7.

[27] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, p. 528–9. *Maktūbāt-i Ashrafī*, loc. cit., states that the

enemies of the Shaykh "fell ill in that very assembly, and in two or three days most of the accusers took their baggage to the caravan of the Last Day."

[28] *Siyar al-ʿārifīn*, p. 90. The *Qāẓī*'s name is there given as Rukn al-Dīn.

[29] See the anecdote of the undoing of the Khwārazmshāh, quoted above.

[30] Two years after the death of Niẓām al-Dīn, the transfer of the population of Delhi to Devgīr or Dawlatābād was initiated in 1327. The date of the move, which has been contested, is confirmed by the variant recension of Baranī, *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī*, Digby Ms 57, f. 160; Bodleian Ms 173, f. 191; Bihāmad Khānī, *Taʾrīkh-i Muḥammadī*, BM [BL] Ms Or. 137, ff. 399–400. The mention of famine and plague (*wabā*) appear to refer to the period of the return of Muḥammad bin Tughluq to Delhi with an army bearing the disease (possibly the great bubonic plague of the Black Death) after his Warangal expedition; see Barani, *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī*, pp. 481–2; Digby Ms 57, f. 161; Bodleian Ms 173, ff. 194–5; ʿIṣāmī, pp. 469–71. The standard recension of Baranī is specific on famine around Delhi at the time of the Sultan's return, while the variant mentions the gradual drifting back of the population from Dawlatābād which preceded this. ʿIṣāmī is clear that the epidemic still affected the army when the Sultan marched from Dawlatābād to Delhi; and Gēsūdarāz describes its ravages in Delhi around 1337, see Ḥusaynī, *Jawāmiʿ al-kalim*, p. 293. A. M. Husain gives a date of January 1335 to July 1337 for "the Emperor's journey from Delhī to Wārangal and back," but advances no reasons for his conjecture; see his *Tughluq Dynasty* (Calcutta, 1963), p. 657.

[31] The question arises whether these words are part of the quotation from the lost *Ḥasrat-nāma* of Baranī, or a remark of Amīr Khwurd himself. If they were the latter, they could date from as late as *ca.* 1400, when the latest additions to the text of the *Siyar al-awliyāʾ* appear to have been made. This is improbable in view of the tranquillity and partial return to prosperity of the early decades of the reign of Fērōz Shāh Tughluq. If, as is likely, the words are those of the *Ḥasrat-nāma*, it is unlikely that they were written at the same time as the accounts by Baranī in his *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī* of Muḥammad bin Tughluq's reign. The first of these was evidently completed in 1354, and the revised version two years later. In these there is no mention of Niẓām al-Dīn's displeasure among the causes of the disasters, which are there ascribed to the waywardness of the Sultan Muḥammad. It would therefore seem likely that the *Ḥasrat-nāma* is a composition from an earlier phase of Baranī's thought, probably written between 1335 and 1340.

[32] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, pp. 531–2.

[33] The accusation is openly voiced by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, whose account was recorded, out of range of the wrath of the Tughluqs, in the distant Maghrib; *Riḥla*, III, pp. 212–13; tr. Gibb, III, pp. 654–5.

[34] Cf. the efforts of Fērōz Shāh to procure letters of satisfaction (*khuṭūṭ-i khwushnūdī*) from the heirs of those whom Sultan Muḥammad had killed or mutilated; *Futūḥāt-i Fērōzshāhī*, ed. S.A. Rashid (Aligarh, 1954), p. 16; tr. in Elliot and Dowson, *History of India*, IV, p. 385.

[35] Sihrindī, *Taʾrīkh-i Mubārakshāhī*, p. 97. A calque of this story, set in the Deccan some fifty years later, displays the Bahmanī Sultan Mujāhid Shāh (regn. 1375–8) struck down by the sword of an African slave as he returned from the siege of Adhoni for a reckoning with Shaykh Sirāj al-Dīn Junaydī; see Muḥammad Sulṭān, *Armughān-i Sulṭānī* (Agra, 1902), p. 167.

[36] *Riḥla*, III, 212–13. For the bestowal of the kingdom by Sufi *shaykhs* and this instance, see below.

[37] *Riḥla*, III, pp. 293–311; tr. Gibb, III, pp. 697–706; for the Sultan's quarrel with the *shaykhs*, see M. Habib, "Shaikh Nasiruddin Mahmud Chiragh-i-Delhi as a Great Historical Personality", repr. in *Politics and Society during the Early Medieval Period: Collected Works of Professor Mohammad Habib*, ed. Nizami (Aligarh-Delhi, 1974), pp. 367–73.

[38] See Digby, "Muḥammad bin Tughluq's Last Years in Kathiavad and his Invasions of Thatha", in H. Khuhro, ed., *Sind Through the Centuries* (Karachi, 1981), pp. 130–8, and references there given.

[39] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, pp. 245–6. More correctly, the Sultan summoned Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd and other notables of Delhi to Kathiawar before his army crossed the Rann of Kacch to Thattha in Sind.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 246. Cf. *Khayr al-majālis*, Nizami's introduction, p. 58.

[41] Ḥusaynī, *Jawāmiʿ al-kalim*, p. 240.

[42] For the hostility between the Chishtī and Firdawsī *silsilas*, see Digby, 1986 (1), pp. 63–7.

[43] Shaykh Shuʿayb, *Manāqib al-asfiyāʾ*. (Calcutta, 1895), p. 130.

[44] See K. S. Lal, *Twilight of the Sultanate*, (Bombay, 1963), pp. 1–15, 27–31; substantially reinterpreted by Digby, *War-Horse and Elephant in the Delhī Sultanate* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 74–82.

[45] *Dīwān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, ed. M. Qazwīnī and A. Ghanī (Tehran, 1320 Shamsī, No. 411, p. 284. Cf. ibid., No. 49, *bayt 7*, p. 35:
Kings are the direction of prayer of the world, and yet
Its reason is service of the presence of *darvēshs*.

[46] Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī* (Calcutta, 1864), pp. 160–1.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

[48] ʿIṣāmī, p. 119; cf. Nizami, *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India During the Thirteenth Century*, pp. 302–3.

[49] The earliest anecdote, recorded by Jūzjānī with a more than fair semblance of historicity, is set in Bukhara. In the late twelfth-century, a boy-slave could have been brought from Bukhara to Baghdad, but this diminishes the likelihood of him subsequently becoming a slave-élite soldier in the Ghorid army of India. For the purpose of this anecdote and those which follow, Baghdad had a much greater Sufi charisma in this period; and the future ruler's transfer there would have been necessary for his encounter with some of the *shaykhs* mentioned. See also notes 50, 53 below.

[50] *Fawāʾid al-fuʾād*, p. 358; conversation of 13 Safar 1319/5 April 1319. The association of Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī and Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī in Baghdad is well attested: see the early anonymous *Manāqib-i Awḥad al-Dīn*, ed. B. Firuzanfarr (Tehran, 1347 Shamsī), passim.

[51] *Siyar al-ârifîn*, pp. 112–13. As elsewhere, Jamālī has tidied up the anecdote as found in his source and adorned it with picturesque details giving it a bogus but attractive circumstantiality.

[52] M. Habib first recognized the character of such spurious collections of Chishtī *Malfūẓāt*, and he also noted the evidence for their circulation before the middle of the fourteenth century; see Habib, ed. Nizami, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period* (Aligarh-New Delhi, 1974), I, pp. 402, 410–11; cf. Ḥamīd Qalandar, *Khayr al-majālis*, pp. 52–3. Further evidence for this dating is provided by citations of the *malfūẓ-i Khwāja Quṭb al-Dīn* in the (genuine) *Malfūẓāt* of Sharaf al-Dīn Manērī, *Mukhkh al-maʿānī*, Digby Ms 8, ff. 27a, 45b. The presence of Muʿīn al-Dīn in this company at Baghdad is at best doubtful; see Digby 1986 [1], p. 62; P. M. Currie, *The Shrine and Cult of Muʿīn al-Dīn* (Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1989), Map on front endpaper of places associated by successive hagiographers with the travels of the *Shaykh*.

[53] Pseudo-Farīd al-Dīn, *Fawāʾid al-sālikīn* (Delhi, Mujtabāʾī Press, 1311/1892). p. 16.

[54] Ilāhdiyā Chishtī, *Siyar al-aqṭāb*, p. 134. Ilāhdiyā is drawing upon Pseudo-Farīd quoted above, affording an identifiable instance of the travelling of a visibly falsified anecdote from a less reputable source into a more honest, if credulous, compilation.

[55] *Riḥla*, III, p. 171; tr. Husain, p. 36.

[56] ʿIṣāmī, pp. 123–4.

[57] *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, pp. 79–80. The story of the visit of Ulugh Khân, without mention of the inquiry and prophecy, is told in *Fawāʾid al-fuʾād*, p. 171, and again in *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, p. 250.

[58] ʿIṣāmī, pp. 225–6. The name of this man, which can be inferred from p. 225, line 2, and p. 226, line 5, is given in the rubric on p. 224. He is described as from Damascus.

[59] For depictions of the divine bestowal on Sasanian monarchs, see F. Sarre, *Die Kunst des alten Persien* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 37–8, 42, Pls 70, 71, 78, 81. For the survival of this symbolism in the Islamic world, see Ernest J. Grube, "Fostat Fragments" in B. W. Robinson, ed.,

Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book (London, 1976), p. 35.

[60] For Bābā Ṭāhir's bestowal of a ring from the top of his waterpot (*ibrīq*) on the Seljuk Sultan Ṭughril Beg, see Rāwandī, *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* (London, 1921), p. 99.

[61] ʿIṣāmī, p. 229. That the name of the *majdhūb* was Gurg, and not Karak as remembered in modern times, is evident from his recorded remarks and verses; see Digby 1984, pp. 98, 107 note 116.

[62] Amīr Khusraw, *Tughluq-nāma* (Hyderabad-Awrangabad, 1352/1933), pp. 72–3, lines 1373–4.

[63] S. M. Ikrām, *Āb-i Kawthar* (Lahore, 1965), p. 395. Both this folk tradition and Amīr Khusraw's unnamed *pīr* of note 62 probably refer to Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn's grandson and successor, 'Alā' al-Dīn "Mawj-i Daryā". The connection of the Tughluq family with this *shaykh* dated from before they attained the throne. Muḥammad b. Tughluq erected the tomb of the Shaykh which is still standing, and appointed his son Muʿizz al-Dīn to high office in Gujarāt; see *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, p. 196. For Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his next two successors being given sovereignty by this *shaykh*, see ʿAfīf, *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī* (Calcutta, 1891), pp. 27, translated below. Cf. also ʿAfīf, *op. cit.*, p. 371; Baranī, *TFS*, p. 543; Hodivala, *Studies in Indo-Muslim history*, I, pp. 334–5.

[64] *Riḥla*, III, p. 211; tr. Gibb, III, p. 652. Niẓām al-Dīn died shortly (probably some months) afterwards, and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa mentions that the future Sultan carried the bier of the Shaykh on his shoulders, a detail which is corroborated by another contemporary Arabic source; *Riḥla*, III, p. 211; tr. Gibb, III, p. 654; see Hodivala, *op. cit.*, I, p. 292. Understandably, mention of this, like the Shaykh's words of bestowal, has been omitted from the accounts of the burial of Niẓām al-Dīn by Amīr Khwurd and later hagiographers; cf. the account of his funeral in *Siyar al-awliyāʾ*, p. 155.

[65] Cf. the explanation of the cause of the same Sultan's death in *ibid.*, pp. 245–6, cited above, p. 74

[66] Notable examples among *shaykhs* in India who were the Sultan's contemporaries are Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn "Makhdūm-i Jahāniyān" and Sayyid Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī.

[67] There is some similarity to Ḥamīd Qalandar's anecdote of why he himself had taken the name and garb of *Qalandar*, see *Khayr al-majālis*, pp. 10–11; Digby 1984, pp. 71–2. Both anecdotes show Niẓām al-Dīn taking a benevolent interest in small boys attending his *khānaqāh*, impelled by their name or behaviour to make a prophecy regarding their future.

[68] See p. 74 above, and notes 37, 38.

[69] ʿAfīf, *Taʾrīkh-i Fērōzshāhī*, pp. 27–9. ʿAfīf consciously imitates accounts of *manāqib* (virtues, eminent deeds of Sufis or other good Muslims). The close of the notice again suggests an influence of Ḥamīd Qalandar's *Khayr al-majālis* as a model; cf. Digby 1984, pp. 71–2. ʿAfīf's account of these tidings is reproduced in Makkī, *Ẓafar al-wālih*, ed E. Denison Ross as *An Arabic History of Gujarat* (London, 1910–28), III, pp. 893–4.

[70] Salīm, *Riyāẓ al-salāṭīn* (Calcutta, 1890), p. 94.

[71] Sikandar b. Muḥammad ʿurf Manjhū, *Mirʾāt-i Sikandarī*, ed. S. C. Misra and M. L. Rahman (Baroda, 1961), pp. 10–11. Significant details include the bestowal of a leopard-skin by the Shaykh on Ẓafar Khān, and the prophecy that rule in Gujarāt would remain in Ẓafar Khān's house for a number of generations corresponding to the number of dates that he had offered to the Shaykh: "Some say the number of those dates was twelve or thirteen, and some say more." Cf. the number of dates symbolizing the number of years of the reign of Fērōz Shāh Tughluq in the fourth of ʿAfīf's "tidings" above.

[72] *Mirʾāt-i Sikandarī*, pp. 86–91; Sir E. C. Bailey, *The Local Muhammadan Dynasties: Gujarat* (London, 1886), pp. 153–5.

[73] *Mirʾāt-i Sikandarī*, p. 389.

[74] This anecdote, like the anecdote in ʿAfīf of the three Sultans of the Tughluq dynasty eating from the bowl of Sharaf al-Dīn Pānīpatī, emphasizes the point that Kings are suppliants at the court of the Sufi *shaykh*. See the verses of Amīr Khusraw quoted on p. 72 above and the rubric of Amīr Khwurd cited in note 13.

[75] Ṭabāṭabāʾī, *Burhān-i maʾāthir* (Delhi-Hyderabad, 1936), p. 12; Firishta, *Taʾrīkh* (Bombay, 1832), I, p. 520; (Kanpur, 1874), I, 274; *Ẓafar al-wālih*, I, p. 159. For Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn bestowing a round (*qurṣ*) of bread, of. *Khayr al-majālis*, p. 10.

[76] Muḥammad Sulṭān, *Armughān-i Sulṭānī*, p. 157, citing Rafīʿ al-Dīn Shīrāzī, *Tadhkirat al-mulūk*.

[77] *Armughān-i Sulṭānī*, p. 158. The story of the buried treasure probably has a common origin with Firishta's tale of Ḥasan Kāngū discovering a treasure in the vicinity of Delhi; Firishta, *Taʾrīkh*, Bombay 1832, I, p. 519. H. K. Sherwani states that ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ḥasan Kāngū was crowned by Shaykh Sirāj al-Dīn Junaydī in the enthronement ceremony at Dawlatābād in 1347, but the references which he gives do not support this assertion, and the Shaykh's name is absent from the list of participants in the enthronement mentioned by ʿIṣāmī, a contemporary witness; see Sherwani, *The Bahmanis of the Deccan* (Hyderabad, 1953), pp. 37 and 46, note 83; Firishta, *Taʾrīkh* (Bombay, 1832), I, p. 528 (= Kanpur 1874, I, 277); ʿIṣāmī, pp. 554–8.

[78] *Armughān-i Sulṭānī*, p. 177.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 164–5. The investiture of Mujāhid Shāh by Sirāj al-Dīn himself is mentioned.

[80] *Armughān-i Sulṭānī*, p. 178.

[81] *Burhān-i maʾāthir*, p. 48; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 46–7, for an account of Sayyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz's alienation from the Sultan's brother and predecessor, Fērōz Shāh Bahmanī.

[82] ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Shēr Malik Wāʿiẓī, *Risāla dar siyar-i Shāh Niʿmat Allāh Walī*, in J. Aubin, ed., *Matériaux pour la biographie de Shah Niʿmatullah Kermani* (Teheran-Paris, 1956), pp. 316–17. As was the case between the Sultans of Gujarāt and the descendants of Jalāl al-Dīn Bukhārī, intermarriage took place in the Deccan kingdom, with the Bahmanīs giving daughters to the family of Niʿmat Allāh; see *Burhān-i maʾāthir*, p. 68.

[83] Some confusion has been created by the late sixteenth-century historian Ṭabāṭabāʾī, who, when describing the alleged encounter of Ḥasan Kāngū with Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn, refers to the future Sultan by the anachronistic title of al-Walī al-Bahmanī; *Burhān-i maʾāthir*, p. 12. Sherwani compounds this confusion with some errors of his own; see *The Bahmanis of the Deccan*, pp. 37, 46 note 82. Only the title al-Bahmanī is found on the coinage of Sultan Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad I, the immediate *khalīfa* of Shāh Niʿmat Allah; see A. Wahid Khan, *Bahmani Coins* (Hyderabad, 1964), p. 78. However, al-Walī al-Bahmanī is found in the painted inscriptions of his tomb, thought to be nearly contemporary; one may also note among his titles given there *afẓal khalīfati ʾllāh fī ʾl-ʿālamīn* (sic); see G. Yazdani, *Bidar: Its History and Monuments* (Oxford, 1947), p. 125. The strict contemporaneity of this inscription is put in doubt by the fact that the date of death, given as 839/1436, conflicts not only with Firishta as noted by Yazdani, *loc. cit.*, but also with numismatic evidence which supports 838. The use of the title by Aḥmad I is also attested by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Sher Malik, writing in the following reign; see Aubin, *op. cit.*, p. 316. The title al-Walī joined to al-Bahmanī is first found on the coinage in the reign of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Aḥmad II, with earliest recorded date 838/1434–5 and it is last recorded on an undated gold coin of Maḥmūd Shāh (regn. 1482–1518); see Wahid Khan, *Bahmani Coins*, pp. 87, 148. But the regnal name of Maḥmūd's grandson Walī Allāh (regn, 1522–4) would indicate that the spiritual claim was maintained to the end of the dynasty.

[84] *Burhān-i maʾāthir*, pp. 75, 96, 107. It is perhaps significant that no *shaykh* from the great family of Gēsūdarāz appears to have assisted at these enthronements. The descendants of Gēsūdarāz and the tombs at Gulbarga remained a major focus for the devotions of the population of the Deccan down to the present day. By contrast, the unconvincing claims to sanctity of the Bahmanī ruling house were in later times represented by a Lingayat *jangam* assuming the garb and style of a Sufi *pīr* on the occasion of the annual ʿ*urs* at the tomb of Aḥmad Shāh I; see Yazdani, *op. cit.*, p. 116 and Pl. LXXV.